(3)

D

C.F. 100/-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

W.P. NO. 2611 /2005.

PETITIONER

SEWAK RAM SONBARASA,
S/o BRIJLAL, Aged about 57 years,
Notary, R/o Mararpara, behind
Church, Balod, Dist.Durg (C.G.).

P.R. No. 2690/05
Presented on 17/6/05
Dated

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH,
Through Chief Secretary,
Office situated at Secretariate Raipur
(C.G.).

RECEIVED
17.6.
C.G.H.C. BILASPUR

2. Secretary Law and Legal Works
Department, Office situated at
Secretariate Raipur, (C.G.)

3. Secretary Law and Legal Works
Department, Office situated at
Secretariate Raipur, (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS/PROHIBITION/CERTIORARI/ DIRECTION/DIRECTIONS,ORDER/ORDERS.

(20)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No.2611/05 **सन्** **200**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	29-6-2005 Shri N.S. Dhurandhar, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Sandeep Dubey, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents. Heard both the counsel. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that inadvertently the name of respondent No.1 has been incorporated in the array of the parties. Similarly the name of respondent No.2 has again been repeated as respondent No.3, therefore, he is not pressing the relief against respondents No.1 and 3 and he is pressing the relief against respondent No.2 only. By this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India the petitioner has questioned the legality, propriety and correctness of the order dated 10-6-2005 passed by the Deputy Secretary, Law and Legislative Affairs, Government of Chhattisgarh, Raipur. The petitioner's case is that he is a practicing Lawyer and he was granted certificate on 22-6-94 to practice as Notary. Thereafter, it was renewed up to year 1997 and from 1997 to 2000. The certificate was again renewed for a period of 5 years till 21-6-2005 and thereafter the petitioner again applied for renewal and the same has been rejected by the impugned order.	

(21)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in view of the judgment rendered by this Court in W.P. No.3247/2003 (Chandra Prakash Sharma V. State of Chhattisgarh and another) on 24th March, 2005, respondent No.2 ought to have considered the case of the petitioner in the light of that judgment and passed appropriate order. He further submitted that in the circumstances respondent No.2 be directed to consider the case of the petitioner in the light of the above judgment. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, respondent No.2 is directed to consider the case of the petitioner for renewal of the certificate to practice as Notary in the light of above judgment of this Court. Consequently, the order impugned is quashed. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.2132/2005 and I.A. No.5157/2005 stands disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. **Sd/-** **L.C.Bhadoo** **Judge**	

Barve

(पीछे देखिये)